

Appl. No. 10/027,471
Atty. Docket No. 9108*
Amdt. dated February 23, 2006
Reply to Office Action of August 10, 2004
Customer No. 27752

AMENDMENTS TO THE CLAIMS

This listing of claims will replace all prior versions, and listings, of claims in the application:

Listing of Claims:

1-34. (Cancelled)

35. (Currently Amended) ~~The method of claim 1,~~ A method comprising the steps of:
maintaining a library of information;
reading metadata tagged information about a user's work profile and working context and
content within the library of information;
matching the metadata tagged information about content within the library of information
to metadata tagged information about one or more of the user's work profile, the user's
working context, or other content within the library of information using one or more
programmable rules; and
delivering to the user a rank ordered set of the most contextually relevant content from
the library of information based on the matching of the metadata tagged information,
wherein the one or more programmable rules each have a unique identifier (rule ID), a name, and a set of clauses defining the operations of that rule.

36. (Original) The method of claim 35, wherein each clause of the set of clauses comprises two or more of:

a name identifying the metadata field to be matched or operator to be performed;
a weight to be applied to the metadata field if a match is found;
an operator to act on the metadata field to be matched; and
a value for a field representing context.

37. (Original) The method of claim 36, wherein a clause comprises all of a name, a weight, an operator, and a value.

Appl. No. 10/027,471
Atty. Docket No. 9108*
Amdt. dated February 23, 2006
Reply to Office Action of August 10, 2004
Customer No. 27752

38. (Original) The method of claim 36, wherein the clause comprises a value forming a portion of a Boolean expression, and a name representing an operator used to combine all of the clauses.

39. (Original) The method of claim 38, wherein the operator comprises a Boolean operator.

40. (Original) The method of claim 38, wherein the operator comprises a "matches all" match that compares two or more values and excludes a document associated with the value if non-matching values are found.

41. (Original) The method of claim 38, wherein the operator comprises a "matches" match that compares two or more values, accumulates a score for matches found, and excludes a document associated with the values if no matches are found.

42. (Original) The method of claim 38, wherein the operator comprises an "optional" match that compares two or more values and accumulates a score for matches found.

43. (Original) The method of claim 38, wherein the operator comprises an "optional text" match that breaks text strings associated with a document into component words excluding basic words, conjunctions, and prepositions and accumulates a score for matches found.

44. (Original) The method of claim 38, wherein the operator comprises a "matches text" match that breaks text strings associated with a document into component words excluding basic words, conjunctions, and prepositions, accumulates a score for matches found, and excludes a document associated with the values if no matches are found.

45. (Original) The method of claim 38, further comprising:
generating a relevance value for each match by combining the relative weight of each matching metadata field and the number of values that match the document of interest for matching;

if the relevance value for a document exceeds a pre-defined threshold, deeming the document to be relevant and including the document in a list of relevant documents; and

Appl. No. 10/027,471
Atty. Docker No. 9108*
Amdt. dated February 23, 2006
Reply to Office Action of August 10, 2004
Customer No. 27752

if the relevance value for a document does not exceed a pre-defined threshold, deeming the document to be irrelevant.

46. (Original) The method of claim 45, further comprising sorting documents deemed to be relevant, by relevance, from most relevant to least relevant, and presenting, for display to the user, only a top tier of documents deemed to be most relevant.

47. (Original) The method of claim 46, wherein any document that matches itself in the list of relevant documents is discarded and is not presented for display to the user.

48. (Original) The method of claim 45, wherein each weight is defined as a number from 1 to 10 and the threshold is defined as a number from 1 to 100.

49. (Original) The method of claim 35, wherein a position of a user in a user interface results in the use of a lookup table to identify a matching programmable rule ID from a rules repository, where the rule ID is used to control a contextual relevance algorithm that will be applied in the user interface.

50. (Currently Amended) The method of claim ~~43~~5, wherein a user repository containing the library of information may reside fully in a centralized database or at a customer location.

51. (Original) The method of claim 50, wherein the user repository, if located at a customer location, is synchronized with the centralized database and its user records on an initial and ongoing basis.

52. (Original) The method of claim 38, further comprising generating a relevance value for each match by using the relative weight of each matching metadata field that match the document of interest for matching.

53. (Original) The method of claim 38, further comprising generating a relevance value for each match by using the number of values that match the document of interest for matching.

54. (Original) The method of claim 38, further comprising generating a relevance value for each match by combining the relative weight of each matching metadata field and the number of values that match the document of interest for matching.

Appl. No. 10/027,471
Atty. Docket No. 9108*
Amdt. dated February 23, 2006
Reply to Office Action of August 10, 2004
Customer No. 27752

55. (Original) The method of claim 52, further comprising:

if the relevance value for a document exceeds a pre-defined threshold, deeming the document to be relevant and including the document in a list of relevant documents; and
if the relevance value for a document does not exceed a pre-defined threshold, deeming the document to be irrelevant.

56. (Original) The method of claim 53, further comprising:

if the relevance value for a document exceeds a pre-defined threshold, deeming the document to be relevant and including the document in a list of relevant documents; and
if the relevance value for a document does not exceed a pre-defined threshold, deeming the document to be irrelevant.

57. (Original) The method of claim 54, further comprising:

if the relevance value for a document exceeds a pre-defined threshold, deeming the document to be relevant and including the document in a list of relevant documents; and
if the relevance value for a document does not exceed a pre-defined threshold, deeming the document to be irrelevant.

58-93. (Cancelled)

94. (Currently Amended) ~~The system of claim 60,~~ A system comprising:

a database to maintain a library of information; and

a contextual relevance engine to read metadata tagged information about a user's work profile and working context and content within the library of information, match the metadata tagged information about content within the library of information to metadata tagged information about one or more of the user's work profile, the user's working context, or other content within the library of information using one or more programmable rules, and deliver to the user a rank ordered set of the most contextually relevant content from the library of information based on the matching of the metadata tagged information, wherein the one or more programmable rules each have a unique identifier (rule ID), a name, and a set of clauses defining the operations of that rule.

Appl. No. 10/027,471
Atty. Docket No. 9108*
Amdt. dated February 23, 2006
Reply to Office Action of August 10, 2004
Customer No. 27752

95. (Original) The system of claim 94, wherein each clause of the set of clauses comprises two or more of:

a name identifying the metadata field to be matched or operator to be performed;

a weight to be applied to the metadata field if a match is found;

an operator to act on the metadata field to be matched; and

a value for a field representing context.

96. (Original) The system of claim 95, wherein a clause comprises all of a name, a weight, an operator, and a value.

97. (Original) The system of claim 95, wherein the clause comprises a value forming a portion of a Boolean expression, and a name representing an operator used to combine all of the clauses.

98. (Original) The system of claim 97, wherein the operator comprises a Boolean operator.

99. (Original) The system of claim 97, wherein the operator comprises a "matches all" match that compares two or more values and excludes a document associated with the value if non-matching values are found.

100. (Original) The system of claim 97, wherein the operator comprises a "matches" match that compares two or more values, accumulates a score for matches Found, and excludes a document associated with the values if no matches are found.

101. (Original) The system of claim 97, wherein the operator comprises an "optional" match that compares two or more values and accumulate a score for matches found.

102. (Original) The system of claim 97, wherein the operator comprises an "optional text" match that breaks text strings associated with a document into component words excluding basic words, conjunctions, and prepositions and accumulates a score for matches found.

103. (Original) The system of claim 97, wherein the operator comprises a "matches text" match that breaks text strings associated with a document into component words

Appl. No. 10/027,471
Atty. Docket No. 9108*
Amdt. dated February 23, 2006
Reply to Office Action of August 10, 2004
Customer No. 27752

excluding basic words, conjunctions, and prepositions, accumulates a score for matches found, and excludes a document associated with the values if no matches are found.

104. (Original) The system of claim 97, wherein the contextual relevance engine further: generate a relevance value for each match by combining the relative weight of each matching metadata field and the number of values that match the document of interest for matching:

if the relevance value for a document exceeds a pre-defined threshold, deems the document to be relevant and includes the document in a list of relevant documents; and

if the relevance value for a document does not exceed a pre-defined threshold, deems the document to be irrelevant.

105. (Original) The system of claim 104, wherein the contextual relevance engine further sorts documents deemed to be relevant, by relevance, from most relevant to least relevant, and presenting, for display to the user, only a top tier of documents deemed to be most relevant.

106. (Original) The system of claim 105, wherein any document that matches itself in the list of relevant documents is discarded and is not presented for display to the user.

107. (Original) The system of claim 104, wherein each weight is defined as a number from 1 to 10 and the threshold is defined as a number from 1 to 100.

108. (Original) The system of claim 94, wherein a position of a user in a user interface results in the use of a lookup table to identify a matching programmable rule ID from a rules repository, where the rule ID is used to control a contextual relevance algorithm that will be applied in the user interface.

109. (Original) The system of claim ~~6094~~ 94, wherein a user repository containing the library of information may reside fully in a centralized database or at a customer location.

110. (Original) The system of claim 109, wherein the user repository, if located at a customer location, is synchronized with the centralized database and its user records on an initial and ongoing basis.

Appl. No. 10/027,471
Atty. Docket No. 9108*
Amdt. dated February 23, 2006
Reply to Office Action of August 10, 2004
Customer No. 27752

111. (Original) The system of claim 97, further comprising generating a relevance value for each match by using the relative weight of each matching metadata field that match the document of interest for matching.

112. (Original) The system of claim 97, further comprising generating a relevance value for each match by using the number of values that match the document of interest for matching.

113. (Original) The system of claim 97, further comprising generating a relevance value for each match by combining the relative weight of each matching metadata field and the number of values that match the document of interest for matching.

114. (Original) The system of claim 111, further comprising:

if the relevance value for a document exceeds a pre-defined threshold, deeming the document to be relevant and including the document in a list of relevant documents; and
if the relevance value for a document does not exceed a pre-defined threshold, deeming the document to be irrelevant.

115. (Original) The system of claim 112, further comprising:

if the relevance value for a document exceeds a pre-defined threshold, deeming the document to be relevant and including the document in a list of relevant documents; and
if the relevance value for a document does not exceed a pre-defined threshold, deeming the document to be irrelevant.

116. (Original) The system of claim 113, further comprising:

if the relevance value for a document exceeds a pre-defined threshold, deeming the document to be relevant and including the document in a list of relevant documents; and
if the relevance value for a document does not exceed a pre-defined threshold, deeming the document to be irrelevant.

117-152. (Cancelled)

153. (Original) ~~The machine-readable medium of claim 119, A machine-readable medium having stored thereon data representing sequences of instructions, the sequences of instructions which, when executed by a processor, cause the processor to:~~

Page 8 of 13

Appl. No. 10/027,471
Atty. Docket No. 9108*
Amdt. dated February 23, 2006
Reply to Office Action of August 10, 2004
Customer No. 27752

maintain a library of information;

read metadata tagged information about a user's work profile and working context and content within the library of information;

match the metadata tagged information about content within the library of information to metadata tagged information about one or more of the user's work profile, the user's working context, or other content within the library of information using a one or more programmable rules; and

deliver to the user a rank ordered set of the most contextually relevant content from the library of information based on the matching of the metadata tagged information, wherein the one or more programmable rules each have a unique identifier (rule ID), a name, and a set of clauses defining the operations of that rule.

154. (Original) The machine-readable medium of claim 153, wherein each clause of the set of clauses comprises two or more of:

a name identifying the metadata field to be matched or operator to be performed;

a weight to be applied to the metadata field if a match is found;

an operator to act on the metadata field to be matched; and

a value for a field representing context.

155. (Original) The machine-readable medium of claim 154, wherein a clause comprises all of a name, a weight, an operator, and a value.

156. (Original) The machine-readable medium of claim 154, wherein the clause comprises a value forming a portion of a Boolean expression, and a name representing an operator used to combine all of the clauses.

157. (Original) The machine-readable medium of claim 156, wherein the operator comprises a Boolean operator.

158. (Original) The machine-readable medium of claim 156, wherein the operator comprises a "matches all" match that compares two or more values and excludes a document associated with the value if non-matching values are found.

Appl. No. 10/027,471
Atty. Docket No. 9108*
Amdt. dated February 23, 2006
Reply to Office Action of August 10, 2004
Customer No. 27752

159. (Original) The machine-readable medium of claim 156, wherein the operator comprises a "matches" match that compares two or more values, accumulates a score for matches found, and excludes a document associated with the values if no matches are found.

160. (Original) The machine-readable medium of claim 156, wherein the operator comprises an "optional" match that compares two or more values and accumulates a score for matches found.

161. (Original) The machine-readable medium of claim 156, wherein the operator comprises an "optional text" match that breaks text strings associated with a document into component words excluding basic words, conjunctions, and prepositions and accumulates a score for matches found.

162. (Original) The machine-readable medium of claim 156, wherein the operator comprises a "matches text" match that breaks text strings associated with a document into component words excluding basic words, conjunctions, and prepositions, accumulates a score for matches found, and excludes a document associated with the values if no matches are found.

163. (Original) The machine-readable medium of claim 156, wherein the instruction further cause the processor to:

generate a relevance value for each match by combining the relative weight of each matching metadata field and the number of values that match the document of interest for matching;

if the relevance value for a document exceeds a pre-defined threshold, deem the document to be relevant and include the document in a list of relevant documents; and

if the relevance value for a document does not exceed a pre-defined threshold, deem the document to be irrelevant.

164. (Original) The machine-readable medium of claim 163, wherein the instructions further cause the processor to sort documents deemed to be relevant, by relevance, from most relevant to least relevant, and presenting, for display to the user, only a top tier of documents deemed to be most relevant.

Appl. No. 10/027,471
Atty. Docket No. 9108*
Amdt. dated February 23, 2006
Reply to Office Action of August 10, 2004
Customer No. 27752

165. (Original) The machine-readable medium of claim 164, wherein any document that matches itself in the list of relevant documents is discarded and is not presented for display to the user.

166. (Original) The machine-readable medium of claim 163, wherein each weight is defined as a number from 1 to 10 and the threshold is defined as a number from 1 to 100.

167. (Original) The machine-readable medium of claim 153, wherein a position of a user in a user interface results in the use of a lookup table to identify a matching programmable rule ID from a rules repository, where the rule ID is used to control a contextual relevance algorithm that will be applied in the user interface.

168. (Original) The machine-readable medium of claim ~~149~~153, wherein a user repository containing the library of information may reside fully in a centralized database or at a customer location.

169. (Original) The machine-readable medium of claim 168, wherein the user repository, if located at a customer location, is synchronized with the centralized database and its user records on an initial and ongoing basis.

170. (Original) The machine-readable medium of claim 156, further comprising generating a relevance value for each match by using the relative weight of each matching metadata field that match the document of interest for matching.

171. (Original) The machine-readable medium of claim 156, further comprising generating a relevance value for each match by using the number of values that match the document of interest for matching.

172. (Original) The machine-readable medium of claim 156, further comprising generating a relevance value for each match by combining the relative weight of each matching metadata field and the number of values that match the document of interest for matching.

173. (Original) The machine-readable medium of claim 170, further comprising:
if the relevance value for a document exceeds a pre-defined threshold, deeming the document to be relevant and including the document in a list of relevant documents; and

Appl. No. 10/027,471
Atty. Docket No. 9108*
Amdt. dated February 23, 2006
Reply to Office Action of August 10, 2004
Customer No. 27752

if the relevance value for a document does not exceed a pre-defined threshold, deeming the document to be irrelevant.

174. (Original) The machine-readable medium of claim 171, further comprising:

if the relevance value for a document exceeds a pre-defined threshold, deeming the document to be relevant and including the document in a list of relevant documents; and

if the relevance value for a document does not exceed a pre-defined threshold, deeming the document to be irrelevant.

175. (Original) The machine-readable medium of claim 172, further comprising:

if the relevance value for a document exceeds a pre-defined threshold, deeming the document to be relevant and including the document in a list of relevant documents: and

if the relevance value for a document does not exceed a pre-defined threshold, deeming the document to be irrelevant.

176. (Original) The machine-readable medium of ~~claim~~ claim 424153, wherein the ~~documents~~ contextually relevant content comprise office documents such as Microsoft Word documents, spreadsheets or presentations.

177. (Original) The machine-readable medium of claim ~~424153~~, wherein the ~~documents~~ contextually relevant content comprise rich media content such as text, images, audio, video and interactive media.